DP

UNITED
NATIONS

Governing Council
of the
United Nations
Development Programme

Distr.
GENERAL

DP/1993/INF/1
17 February 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

PROPOSAL CONCERNING LOCATION OF THE HEADQUARTERS OF THE UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME, THE UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND AND THE UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT FUND FOR WOMEN

The attached progress report is being circulated to members of the Governing Council in accordance with paragraph 2 (d) of Council decision 92/44 of 26 May 1992

SUMMARY

In its decision 92/44 of 26 May 1992, the Governing Council requested the Administrator to examine the following three aspects of the proposal to relocate the headquarters of UNDP, UNFPA and UNIFEM to Bonn:

(a) Impact for the United Nations system as a whole;

(b) Impact for Governments;

(c) Financial and administrative implications.

The present report contains information on progress to date. A full report will be presented to the Governing Council at its fortieth session.

93-09135 (E) 150393 180393

/...

INTRODUCTION

1. In its decision 92/44 of 26 May 1992, the Governing Council took note with appreciation of the proposal submitted by Germany to host the headquarters of the United Nations Development Programme, of its affiliated funds and of the United Nations Population Fund in Bonn from 1996 onwards.

2. In paragraph 2 of decision 92/44, the Governing Council requested the Administrator:

(a) To examine in consultation with the members of the Programme the potential impact of such relocation on the objective of reforming the United Nations system of operational activities for development with a view to improving its coherence and efficiency and on cooperation with the international and regional finance institutions;

(b) To consult with the members of the Programme on the full range of logistical and related financial and administrative and representational implications for Member States of such a relocation;

(c) To examine in consultation with the relevant departments of the United Nations Secretariat all programme-related, budgetary, legal and administrative implications of the offer;

(d) To provide a written report on the results of the implementation of the present decision to the members of the Governing Council, if possible by the end of 1992 but not later than 1 February 1993;

(e) To report on the matters to the Governing Council at its fortieth session (1993).

3. Following the adoption of decision 92/44, discussions were held with officials from the German Government and the United States of America as host Government as well as with the United Nations Secretariat concerning action to be taken in the implementation of the decision. During these discussions the following was agreed:

(a) The implementation of paragraph 2 (a) of decision 92/44 will require a major input by the United Nations Secretariat since it relates to the United Nations system of operational activities for development. A relocation of headquarters would have implications going beyond the competence of UNDP and UNFPA. The United Nations, as well as specialized agencies, would be directly affected. The Administrator will therefore need to receive guidance from the United Nations Secretariat, which will take the lead in the examination requested. An interim report concerning this examination is set forth in section I below.

(b) The implementation of paragraph 2 (b) of decision 92/44 was discussed with representatives of Germany and of the United States of America. As a result of these consultations, the questionnaire reproduced in annex I to the present report was elaborated and forwarded to all members of the Programme.

The results of the implementation of paragraph 2 (b) are set forth in section II below.

(c) The implementation of paragraph 2 (c) of decision 92/44 would involve a number of units in the United Nations Secretariat, UNDP and UNFPA. A working group of representatives from these units, chaired by UNDP, was established to prepare a report concerning paragraph 2 (c). The results of the implementation of paragraph 2 (c) are set forth in section III below.

4. It has been a constant aim to provide the information requested by the Governing Council in a factual and neutral manner. No UNDP, UNFPA or UNIFEM position regarding the proposal is advocated in the present report.

I. IMPACT FOR THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM AS A WHOLE

5. In paragraph 2 (a) of decision 92/44 the Governing Council requests the Administrator to examine in consultation with the members of the Programme the potential impact of a relocation: (a) on the objective of reforming the United Nations system of operational activities for development with a view to improving its coherence and efficiency, and (b) on cooperation with the international and regional finance institutions.

6. This examination requires a major input by the United Nations Secretariat, which has undertaken consultations with Governments in this regard.

7. Following the suspension of the forty-seventh session of the General Assembly, the Secretary-General has, in a note of 22 January 1993 to the members of the Programme (reproduced in annex II to the present report), asked for the views of their Governments on the impact for the United Nations system as a whole of a move of UNDP, UNFPA and UNIFEM to Bonn, taking into account the outcome of the deliberations during the session, including in particular resolution 47/199 of 22 December 1992 on the triennial policy review of the operational activities of the United Nations development system. The deadline for replies is 1 March 1993.

8. The results of this examination will be included in the full report to be presented to the Governing Council at its fortieth session.

II. IMPACT FOR MEMBER STATES

9. In order to consult with Member States, as requested in paragraph 2 (b) of decision 92/44, on the full range of logistical and related financial, administrative and representational implications for Member States of a relocation, the questionnaire reproduced in annex I to the present report was distributed to the members of the Programme with a note dated 4 August 1992. The deadline for receipt of replies was 1 October 1992.

10. During the informal consultations held on 29-30 September 1992, the Secretary of the Governing Council informed the Council that only six Governments had replied and he appealed to the members of the Programme to forward responses to the questionnaire as soon as possible.

11. The questionnaire was again forwarded to the members of the Programme at the beginning of October, with exception of the dozen countries which had replied by then. A new deadline of 15 November 1992 was set for replies.

12. During the informal consultations held on 19 January 1993, the Secretary of the Governing Council informed the Council that individual replies had been received from 37 members of the Programme. Attached to some of these replies was a letter from the Chairman of the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) to the Secretary-General on behalf of the 35 member States of AOSIS.

13. By 1 February 1993, individual replies to the questionnaire had been received from the following 37 countries: Austria; Barbados; Botswana; Brazil; Canada; China; Czechoslovakia; Colombia; Democratic People's Republic of Korea; Denmark; Equatorial Guinea; France; Germany; Guyana; Iraq; Israel; Japan; Lao People's Democratic Republic; Liechtenstein; Malaysia; Mexico; Micronesia (Federated States of); Netherlands; New Zealand; Norway; Oman; Papua New Guinea; Philippines; Russian Federation; Spain; Sweden; Switzerland; Turkey; Uganda; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; Vanuatu (including position of the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS)); Zimbabwe.

14. As can be seen from the above, by 1 February 1993 five countries members of the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) returned individual replies (Barbados, Guyana, the Federated States of Micronesia, Papua New Guinea and Vanuatu). However, all the 35 AOSIS members are covered by the common position stated in the letter of 26 October 1992 from the Chairman of AOSIS to the Secretary-General, which was attached to the replies from Vanuatu (Chairman) and Papua New Guinea. The 35 AOSIS members are the following: Antigua and Barbuda; Bahamas; Barbados; Belize; Cape Verde; Comoros; Cook Islands; Cuba; Cyprus; Dominica; Fiji; Grenada; Guinea-Bissau; Guyana; Jamaica; Kiribati; Maldives; Malta; Marshall Islands; Mauritius; Micronesia (Federated States of); Nauru; Papua New Guinea; Saint Kitts and Nevis; Saint Lucia; Saint Vincent and the Grenadines; Samoa; Sao Tome and Principe; Seychelles; Singapore; Solomon Islands; Tonga; Trinidad and Tobago; Tuvalu; Vanuatu. (AOSIS also has five observers: American Samoa; Guam; Netherlands Antilles; Niue; the United States Virgin Islands.)

15. The questionnaire left it open to members how they would reply to the following four questions:

QUESTION 1 What is the structure of your Government's representation to the United Nations in the United States?

QUESTION 2 What is the structure of your Government's diplomatic presence in Germany and other European countries?

QUESTION 3 What will be the additional representational, logistical, financial and administrative consequences, if any, for your Government in case the headquarters of UNDP, UNFPA and UNIFEM would move to Bonn?

QUESTION 4 What is the overall assessment of the logistical, financial, administrative and representational implications for your Government of a relocation to Bonn of the headquarters of UNDP, its affiliated funds and UNFPA?

16. The replies are very different in form. Some Member States give general remarks covering all questions, others reply specifically to some or to all of the four questions. While the answers to questions 1 and 2 are mainly factual, the answers to questions 3 and 4 tend to be more analytical.

17. The replies fall into four groups:

Group A: Only advantages of a relocation stated.

Four replies fall into group A.

The advantages stated range from better communications and proximity to German Federal Ministries and the North-South Centre Bonn, to shorter travel distance to European capitals and Africa.

Group B: Only disadvantages of a relocation stated.

Replies covering 56 members of the Programme fall into group B.

Individual replies in this group have been received from 26 member States, including 5 individual replies from countries members of the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS). However, all the 35 AOSIS members are covered by the common position stated in the letter of 26 October 1992 from the Chairman of AOSIS to the Secretary-General, which was attached to the replies from Vanuatu (Chairman) and Papua New Guinea.

The disadvantages stated include the views of the AOSIS members and others that a move away from New York would seriously hamper the developing countries in their efforts to interact with UNDP and UNIFEM; the lack of representation in Germany/Europe; functional difficulties when the same representative covers the Second Committee and the Economic and Social Council as well as UNDP and UNFPA; financial burdens of different degrees, from opening a new mission or maintaining some form of diplomatic presence in Bonn to increased travel expenditures.

Group C: Both advantages and disadvantages stated.

Three replies fall into group C.

The range of advantages and disadvantages in these replies is not so wide as in groups A and B: on one side savings in official travel, on the other side, the need for additional personnel.

Group D: Neither advantages nor disadvantages stated.

Four replies fall into group D.

The replies in this group are neutral. They point neither to advantages nor to disadvantages which a relocation to Bonn would bring to member States.

III. PROGRAMME-RELATED, BUDGETARY, LEGAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS

18. In paragraph 2 (c) of decision 92/44, the Governing Council requested the Administrator to examine in consultation with the relevant departments of the United Nations Secretariat all programme-related, budgetary, legal and administrative implications of the offer.

19. This examination has involved a number of units in the United Nations Secretariat, UNFPA and UNDP.

20. A working group of representatives from these units, chaired by the Assistant Administrator and Director of the Bureau for Finance and Administration, UNDP, and reporting to the Associate Administrator of UNDP, was established in September 1992. The working group was requested to undertake a study and establish a framework for identifying indicative costs and key issues that needed to be addressed.

21. The working group reviewed prior experiences of a move of United Nations premises, namely, that of UNIDO from New York to Vienna in 1976-1978. The data obtained assisted the working group in identifying the initial issues that required further elaboration.

22. Taking into consideration the Secretary-General's recent decision relating to the Department for Development Support and Management Services and the Office for Project Services (OPS), the study has identified separate scenarios for the move to Bonn, including OPS and excluding OPS.

23. A series of consultations was held with the relevant units in UNDP, UNFPA, UNIFEM, and the United Nations Secretariat to elaborate further on these issues, define the specific needs and requirements of each and to provide the basis for the costing exercise, including the services currently provided by the United Nations Secretariat.

24. Consultations or briefing sessions were held, as required, with representatives of Germany and of the United States of America, who were kept informed of progress made.

25. Following these discussions, more detailed issues and questions were identified and formed the framework for the exercise. These were divided into three tentative time-frames: (a) those that can be reviewed before the fortieth session of the Governing Council; (b) those that can be taken up only after the fortieth session of the Governing Council; and (c) those that can be addressed should the General Assembly approve the proposed relocation to Bonn.

A detailed analysis of the issues in (a) has therefore been undertaken, the findings of which will be included in the final report. Issues identified for (b) and (c) will be listed in an annex to that report.

26. The Permanent Mission of Germany to the United Nations was requested to provide information pertaining to the availability of services and costs in Bonn. This included more specific details of the premises being offered; availability of conference facilities; preliminary overview of the Bonn housing market; schools in the Bonn-Köln-Düsseldorf area; telecommunication facilities; health insurance; clarifications on legal issues; and price indices.

27. A joint United Nations/UNDP/UNFPA mission to Bonn was fielded in early December 1992 in order to verify and confirm data already collected, identify additional cost elements and further elaborate on issues. More specifically, the mission reviewed and collected information on the following:

(a) Employment conditions and benefits in Bonn and its surrounding area (Köln, Frankfurt and Düsseldorf);

(b) Schools in Bonn: American High School; British High School; British Preparatory School; French High School;

(c) Housing issues;

(d) Training availability including language instruction;

(e) Conference facilities, translation and interpretation availability;

(f) The building that has been offered, its site and architectural plans;

(g) Other possible building complexes;

(h) Post adjustment calculation; General Service salary survey; DSA survey;

(i) Communications facilities and costs;

(j) Transportation facilities and costs;

(k) Other costs: utilities tariffs; supplies/procurement;

(l) Private and government health/medical insurance schemes.

28. The main issues identified by the mission, as well as its preliminary findings, were discussed with the German authorities in Bonn and will be elaborated on in the final report.

29. The report of the working group is currently being finalized and is expected to be submitted shortly to the Associate Administrator of UNDP and to the Department of Administration and Management and the Office of Legal Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat. It will form the basis of the report which the Governing Council will have before it at its fortieth session (1993).

Annex I

NOTE VERBALE OF 4 AUGUST 1992 FROM THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME TO MEMBERS OF THE PROGRAMME WITH QUESTIONNAIRE ATTACHED

The Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme presents his compliments to the Permanent Representative of ... to the United Nations and has the honour to inform him/her that the Governing Council on 26 May 1992 adopted the following decision 92/44 entitled "Proposal concerning location of United Nations Development Programme and United Nations Population Fund Headquarters":

"The Governing Council,

1. Takes note with appreciation of the proposal submitted by Germany to the Governing Council at its thirty-ninth session, to host the headquarters of the United Nations Development Programme, of its affiliated funds and of the United Nations Population Fund in Bonn from 1996 onwards;

2. Requests the Administrator:

(a) To examine in consultation with the members of the Programme the potential impact of such relocation on the objective of reforming the United Nations system of operational activities for development with a view to improving its coherence and efficiency and on cooperation with the international and regional finance institutions;

(b) To consult with the members of the Programme on the full range of logistical and related financial and administrative and representational implications for Member States of such a relocation;

(c) To examine in consultation with the relevant departments of the United Nations Secretariat all programme-related, budgetary, legal and administrative implications of the offer;

(d) To provide a written report on the results of the implementation of the present decision to the members of the Governing Council, if possible by the end of 1992 but not later than 1 February 1993;

(e) To report on the matters to the Governing Council at its fortieth session (1993)."

Following the adoption of this decision discussions have been held with officials from the German Government and the United States of America as host Government as well as with the United Nations Secretariat concerning action to be taken in the implementation of decision 92/44. During these discussions the following has been agreed:

Paragraph 2 (a), which requests the Administrator to examine in consultation with the members of the Programme the potential impact of such

relocation on the objective of reforming the United Nations system of operational activities for development, will require a major input by the United Nations Secretariat as it relates to the United Nations system of operational activities for development. A relocation of headquarters would have implications going beyond the competence of UNDP and UNFPA. The United Nations, and also the Agencies, would be directly affected. The Administrator will therefore need to receive guidance from the United Nations Secretariat, which will take the lead in the examination required by the Council in paragraph 2 (a).

As a result of consultations with representatives of Germany and the United States of America, the attached questionnaire relating to paragraph 2 (b) has been elaborated. It would be appreciated if the replies to the questionnaire could be received by 1 October 1992.

The implementation of paragraph 2 (c) will involve a number of units in the United Nations Secretariat. A working group of representatives from these units, chaired by UNDP, will prepare the report concerning paragraph 2 (c).

As requested in paragraph 2 (d), the Administrator will provide a written report on the results of the implementation of decision 92/44 if possible by the end of 1992 but not later than 1 February 1993.

The proposal concerning relocation of headquarters has been included in the provisional agenda for the fortieth session of the Governing Council in accordance with paragraph 2 (e) of decision 92/44.

QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE FULL RANGE OF LOGISTICAL AND RELATED FINANCIAL, ADMINISTRATIVE AND REPRESENTATIONAL IMPLICATIONS FOR MEMBER STATES OF A RELOCATION OF THE HEADQUARTERS OF THE UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME, OF ITS AFFILIATED FUNDS AND OF THE UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND TO BONN FROM 1996 ONWARDS

BACKGROUND

In its decision 92/44 of 26 May 1992, the Governing Council took note with appreciation of the proposal submitted by Germany to the Council at its thirty-ninth session, to host the headquarters of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), of its affiliated funds and of the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) in Bonn from 1996 onwards.

In paragraph 2 (b) of this decision, the Governing Council requested the Administrator to consult with the members of the Programme on the full range of logistical and related financial and administrative and representational implications for Member States of such a relocation.

The attached questionnaire will be used to obtain the views of the Member States on the matters referred to in paragraph 2 (b). In order to meet the requirements of the Governing Council, it would be appreciated if replies to the questionnaire could be received by 1 October 1992.

Please return the questionnaire to Mr. Jean-Jacques Graisse, Secretary of the Governing Council, 1 United Nations Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10017, U.S.A.

QUESTIONNAIRE

The situation as it now stands:

1. What is the structure of your Government's representation to the United Nations in the United States?

(Items to consider could include the following:

- representation to United Nations development agencies
- representation to international and regional financial institutions located in the United States
- presence in New York
- presence in Washington, D.C.
- personnel (total number, number working on UNDP, UNFPA and UNIFEM issues)
- communication links back to capital (type, time and costs involved)
- other aspects)

2. What is the structure of your Government's diplomatic presence in Germany and other European countries?

(Items to consider could include the following:

- presence in Bonn
- presence in other European cities when responsible for relations with Germany
- presence in other European cities when responsible for relations with international and regional financial and other institutions located in Europe
- personnel (total number, number covering other European countries, if any, number working on United Nations matters, if any)
- communication links back to capital
- other aspects)

The German Parliament has decided to move its seat to Berlin which presumably will require your Government to review its location of diplomatic representation in Germany: 1/

3. What will be the additional representational, logistical, financial and administrative consequences, if any, for your Government in case the headquarters of UNDP, UNFPA and UNIFEM would move to Bonn?

(Items to consider could include the following:

- presence, if any, and personnel in Bonn (number expected to cover UNDP, UNFPA and UNIFEM)

- personnel in Berlin expected to cover UNDP, UNFPA and UNIFEM questions

- personnel in other European cities (please specify number and cities) expected to cover UNDP, UNFPA and UNIFEM

- logistical consequences for your Government of a relocation of UNDP, UNFPA and UNIFEM

- financial implications for your Government of a relocation of the headquarters of UNDP, UNFPA and UNIFEM from New York to Bonn)

4. What is the overall assessment of the logistical, financial, administrative and representational implications for your Government of a relocation to Bonn of the headquarters of UNDP, its affiliated funds and UNFPA?

(This may include specific requests and suggestions or general comments. The assessment should not include those implications resulting purely from a relocation of the German Parliament and partial relocation of the German Government to Berlin)

Notes

1/ On 20 June 1991 the German Bundestag (Parliament) decided to move its seat to Berlin, the capital of the Federal Republic of Germany. The German Government was also called upon to transfer the core of central government to Berlin. In order to ensure a fair division of labour, Bonn is to remain the administrative centre of the Federal Republic of Germany and retain the majority of jobs within the highest administrative authorities of the Federation.

For this reason, the Federal Cabinet took the decision on 3 June 1992 that Bonn would remain a political centre of the Federal Republic of Germany even after the seat of Parliament and core of Government have moved. To this end several interconnected policy areas, in particular development policy and the corresponding Ministries, including certain Ministries of key importance for developing countries (Economic Cooperation, Environment, Research and

Technology, Education and Science, Agriculture), will remain in Bonn. The Federal Chancellery and all the other Ministries will retain offices in Bonn. Each country is free to decide whether to locate its diplomatic mission in Berlin or Bonn or maintain missions in both cities.

Annex II

NOTE VERBALE OF 22 JANUARY 1993 FROM THE SECRETARY-GENERAL TO MEMBERS OF THE UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

The Secretary-General of the United Nations presents his compliments to ... and has the honour to refer to the provisions of paragraph 2 of the attached decision 92/44 adopted by the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme on 26 May 1992, calling for consultations with members of the Programme on various aspects of the potential implications and impact of the proposal submitted by Germany to the Governing Council at its thirty-ninth session, to host in Bonn from 1996 onwards the headquarters of the United Nations Development Programme, of its affiliated funds and of the United Nations Population Fund.

Paragraph 2 (b) of the decision, requesting consultations with members of the Programme on the potential logistical and related implications for Member States of the proposed relocation has already been the subject of a note verbale sent by the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme to members of the Programme on 4 August 1992.

It was considered that the implementation of paragraph 2 (a) of the decision, requesting that an examination be undertaken, in consultation with the members of the Programme, of the potential impact of the proposed relocation on "(i) the objective of reforming the United Nations system of operational activities for development with a view to improving its coherence and efficiency and (ii) cooperation with the international and regional finance institutions", should await deliberations at the forty-seventh session of the General Assembly, particularly as they related to the triennial policy review of the operational activities of the United Nations development system and the restructuring and revitalization of the United Nations in the economic, social and related fields.

Following the suspension of the forty-seventh session, the Secretary-General would be grateful if His/Her Excellency's Government, taking into account the outcome of deliberations during the session, including in particular resolution 47/199 of 22 December 1992 (enclosed), could communicate to him as soon as possible and not later than 1 March 1993, the views of his/her Government on the issues referred to in paragraph 2 (a) of the decision.